



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/662,323	09/14/2000	Seiichi Matsui	0879-0277P	1512
2292	7590	04/04/2008	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				JERABEK, KELLY L
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2622				
NOTIFICATION DATE			DELIVERY MODE	
04/04/2008			ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

1 RECORD OF ORAL HEARING
2

3 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
4

5

6 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
7 AND INTERFERENCES
8

9

10 Ex parte SEIICHI MATSUI
11

12

13 Appeal 2008-0138
14 Application 09/662,323
15 Technology Center 2600
16

17

18 Oral Hearing Held: February 14, 2008
19

20

21

22 Before ANITA PELLMAN GROSS, MAHSHID D. SAADAT, and JOHN
23 A. JEFFERY, Administrative Patent Judges
24

25 ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT:
26

27 CATHERINE M. VOISINET, ESQUIRE
28 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
29 PO BOX 747
30 FALLS CHURCH VA 22040-0747
31

32 The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Thursday, February
33 14, 2008, commencing at 9:36 a.m., at the U.S. Patent and Trademark
34 Office, 600 Dulany Street, 9th Floor, Alexandria, Virginia, before Janice A.
35 Salas, Notary Public.
36

37

1 THE CLERK: Calendar Number 20, Mrs. Voisinet.

2 JUDGE GROSS: Whenever you're ready. You have 20 minutes.

3 MS. VOISINET: Thank you. My name is Cathy Voisinet, and I'm
4 the attorney representing the appellant in this matter.

5 To start off our -- the present invention at issue is a system that -- or
6 an imaging apparatus that seeks to provide low-definition images while
7 maintaining true color. In overcoming prior art systems, typically, prior art
8 systems would read out a number of images while decimating or not reading
9 out other lines of images.

10 And then once the results in images were read out, all of the lines --
11 all of the results in adjacent lines would be processed with each other,
12 resulting in nonadjoining lines being processed and therefore, rendering
13 untrue color.

14 Our imaging apparatus seeks to read out adjoining lines with intervals
15 of plurality of lines that aren't read out where only images that are adjoining
16 are processed and therefore providing true color.

17 In rejecting the claims, the examiner cites a primary reference of
18 Yamaguchi that does provide for a solid-state imaging pickup device that
19 has a line thinning operation, and as depicted, he relies on figure 19 and its
20 related figures, 20 and 21, and as shown in figure 19, a pair of adjoining
21 lines are read out in two different periods.

22 So, for example, the G would be read out in one horizontal period and
23 B would be read out in another horizontal period.

24 The examiner appreciates that Yamaguchi fails to teach a processing
25 device that produces image signals by producing pixel information of one
26 line from the pair of the adjoining lines that are read out, and the examiner

1 relies on the teachings of Harada to cure the deficiencies of Yamaguchi.

2 Harada, in figure 9 -- well, generally, the disclosure of Harada is
3 directed to an imaging apparatus that incorporates three separate solid-state
4 imaging devices or three separate CCDs, one for each color channel, and he
5 relies on the disclosure in figure 9 to teach producing pixel information of
6 one line from the pair of adjoining lines.

7 However, in figure 9, a -- the disclosure is -- and the inventor is
8 concerned with providing a high-definition image, a high-definition motion
9 image, and only one of the CCDs is depicted in that figure, so you're dealing
10 with monochromatic images, and as you can see, there are two separate field
11 outputs.

12 In one field output, one pair -- adjoining lines of, say -- well, in the
13 first field output -- so as you're looking at figure 9, that first set of addition
14 symbols is the first field output and it adds two adjoining lines, and in the
15 second field output, which is that second set of summations, it adds the other
16 adjoining lines -- the other pair of adjoining lines.

17 So effectively, in that figure, all of the lines are processed with each
18 other, and by doing that, they seek to limit spatial frequencies, so effectively,
19 it's like a smoothing process in order to limit the high frequency.

20 So the examiner relies on this teaching, and what he -- what he says in
21 his rejection is a bit confusing to me. He says that Harada discloses
22 processing the first field output signals with the second field output signals,
23 and I don't believe that that's what Harada is doing.

24 If you look at the signals that are output, in the first field output there's
25 no indication that those signals are processed with the signals that are
26 produced from the second field output.

1 And I think that he was trying to do that in order to show that one
2 skilled in the art would be motivated or that there's a teaching to provide
3 outputs from different periods because in Yamaguchi, the separate lines are
4 produced and output in different periods.

5 So first off, I think the examiner is misinterpreting the Harada
6 reference by saying that the first field output signals are processed with the
7 second field output signals.

8 Second, I think that one skilled in the art would not be motivated to
9 modify the teachings of Yamaguchi because the CCD in Yamaguchi appears
10 to be a bear configuration and in Harada you're dealing with a monochrome
11 CCD. So they are processing the adjacent or they're adding the adjacent
12 pixels with each other.

13 And if you took that teaching and applied it to Yamaguchi, you would
14 be effectively mixing the colors and you'd be losing your color information,
15 and I don't believe one skilled in the art would be motivated to do that.

16 So basically, our position is that while based on figure 19 it may
17 appear that there are two adjoining lines being read out, there is no teaching
18 in either of the references that disclose processing one line from a pair of
19 two adjoining lines, both as -- as asserted by the examiner, and further, we
20 maintain that one skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine that.

21 The system in Harada is a completely different CCD. It's a high-
22 definition monochrome CCD, and one skilled in the art would not look to
23 that in order to modify the teachings of Yamaguchi as to how they're
24 outputting their data.

25 And further, we maintain that -- that by making the modification, you
26 would be losing or mixing the color channels, which may effectively render

Appeal 2008-0138
Application 09/662,323

1 the device inoperable by -- because you're losing your -- your color data.

2 JUDGE GROSS: Any questions?

3 Thank you.

4 (Whereupon, the proceedings at 9:45 a.m. were concluded.)

5

6